



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,529	04/12/2004	Jens Braun	INFN 2294-US	3329

46798 7590 05/02/2006
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
Gero McClellan / Infineon Technologies
3040 POST OAK BLVD.,
SUITE 1500
HOUSTON, TX 77056

EXAMINER

SIDDIQUI, SAQIB JAVAID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2138

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/822,529

Applicant(s)

BRAUN, JENS

Examiner

Saqib J. Siddiqui

Art Unit

2138

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/12/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10822529, filed on April 04, 2006.

Oath/Declaration

The Oath filed July 29, 2004 complies with all the requirements set forth in MPEP 602 and therefore is accepted.

Drawings

The filed drawings are accepted.

Specification

The filed specification is accepted.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-21 are objected to because of the following informalities:

As per claims 1, 8, 9, & 18:

The above claims mention "operative operating" as opposed to just operative or just operating. The examiner objects to these claims, as they sound redundant. For the purposes of compact prosecution examiner assumes that applicant meant operating as mentioned in the specification and other claims. Appropriate correction is required.

As per claims 2-7, 10-17, & 19-21:

These claims are objected to by virtue of their dependency. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claims 1-2, 5, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Taylor et al. (Taylor hereinafter) US Pat no. 6,971,051 B2.

As per claim 1:

Taylor teaches a method for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 4, column 1, lines 15-65): conducting a self-test of the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 40-67).

As per claim 2:

Taylor teaches the method as rejected in claim 1 above, further comprising: initiating the self-test by a central processing unit of the application apparatus, the central processing unit arranged outside the multichip memory module (Figure 4 # 40).

As per claim 5:

Taylor teaches the method as rejected in claim 1 above further comprising: providing signals (Figure 4), utilizing a self-test control device (column 6, lines 35-40), to a control input of the DRAM memory chip and a control input at the nonvolatile memory chip (column 6, lines 35-65); and disconnecting control input signals from outside the multichip memory module (Figure 3 # 36, column 6, lines 25-35).

As per claim 6:

Taylor teaches the method as rejected in claim 1 above, further comprising selecting addresses of the DRAM memory chip to test memory cells utilizing a self-test control device disposed in the DRAM memory chip (column 6, lines 5-45).

As per claim 11:

Taylor teaches the method as rejected in claim 1 above, wherein the self-test is conducted in a period from at least one of: during a battery charging period of the application apparatus; during a standby period of the application apparatus; after a battery change of the application apparatus; after an initial switch-on of the application apparatus; after a switch-off of the application apparatus; and according to a time schedule stored in the nonvolatile memory chip (column 5, lines 3-21).

Claims 1-2, 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Lai et al. (Lai hereinafter) US Pat no. 6,671,836 B1.

As per claims 1, 12, & 18:

Lai teaches a method, apparatus and means for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 1): apparatus, method, and means for conducting a self-test of the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 30-67).

As per claim 2:

Lai teaches the method as rejected in claim 1 above, further comprising: initiating the self-test by a central processing unit of the application apparatus, the central processing unit arranged outside the multichip memory module (Figure 1 # 130).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 3-4, 7-8, and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor US Pat no. 6,971,051 B2, and further in view of Barr US Pat no. 5,758,056.

As per claim 3:

Taylor substantially teaches a method for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 1): conducting a self-test of the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 30-67), wherein a data bus of the DRAM memory chip and a data bus of the nonvolatile memory chip are connected (Figure 4 # 64).

Taylor does not explicitly teach storing addresses of defective memory cells in the nonvolatile memory chip.

However, Barr in an analogous art teaches storing addresses of defective memory cells in the nonvolatile memory chip (Figure 1 # 16, column 4, lines 1-31). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the Taylor's invention to store the exact location of the defective memory cell, as it would have enabled the recovery module in Taylor's invention to correct the exact error cell as opposed to resetting the whole DRAM, which would significantly cut down the testing time. Further it should be noted that recovering

Art Unit: 2138

defective addresses and storing them is commonly known in the art and is used repeatedly specially when memory testing is involved.

As per claim 4:

Taylor/Barr teach the method as rejected in claim 3 above except for explicitly stating the switching means to deactivate or activate the bus. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method to deactivate the data bus, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, USPQ 233.

As per claim 7:

Taylor/Barr substantially teaches the method as rejected in claim 3 above.

Taylor does not explicitly teach selecting addresses of the non-volatile chip to store the defective addresses of the DRAM.

However, Barr in an analogous art teaches selecting addresses of the nonvolatile memory chip to store the addresses of the defective memory cells of the DRAM memory chip utilizing a central processing unit (Figure 1 # 11, column 4, lines 1-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the Taylor's invention to store the exact location of the defective memory cell, as it would have enabled the recovery module in Taylor's invention to correct the exact error cell as opposed to resetting the whole DRAM, which would significantly cut down the testing time. Further it should be noted that recovering

Art Unit: 2138

defective addresses and storing them is commonly known in the art and is used repeatedly specially when memory testing is involved.

As per claim 8:

Taylor/Barr substantially teaches the method as rejected in claim 7 above wherein the addresses of the defective memory cells are read from the nonvolatile memory chip by the central processing unit in the operative operating mode of the application apparatus (Taylor, column 5, lines 40-57 & Barr column 3, lines 25-65).

As per claim 9:

Taylor/Barr substantially teaches the method as rejected in claim 8 above except for explicitly stating skipping the defective memory addresses. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to skip the defective addresses, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, USPQ 233.

As per claim 10:

Taylor substantially teaches a method for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 1): conducting a self-test of the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 30-67).

Taylor does not explicitly teach the replacement of defective memory cells with redundant memory cells in the DRAM memory chip.

However, Barr in an analogous art teaches the replacement of defective memory cells with redundant memory cells in the DRAM memory chip (Figure 1 # 18, column 3, lines 25-60). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the Taylor's invention to replace the defective addresses with redundant memory cells, as it would have enabled Taylor's invention to correct the exact error cell as opposed to resetting the whole DRAM, which would significantly cut down the testing time. Further it should be noted that replacing defective addresses using redundant cells is commonly known in the art and is used repeatedly in the art specially when memory testing is involved.

Claims 3-4, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lai US Pat no. 6,671,836 B1, and further in view of Barr US Pat no. 5,758,056.

As per claim 3:

Lai substantially teaches a method for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 1): conducting a self-test of the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 30-67), wherein a data bus of the DRAM memory chip and a data bus of the nonvolatile memory chip are connected (column 3, lines 55-67).

Lai does not explicitly teach storing addresses of defective memory cells in the nonvolatile memory chip.

However, Barr in an analogous art teaches storing addresses of defective memory cells in the nonvolatile memory chip (Figure 1 # 16, column 4, lines 1-31). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the Lai's invention to store the exact location of the defective memory cell, as it would have enabled Lai's invention to exactly pin point the error cell as opposed to resetting the whole DRAM, which would significantly cut down the testing time. Further it should be noted that recovering defective addresses and storing them is commonly known in the art and is used repeatedly specially when memory testing is involved.

As per claim 4:

Lai/Barr teach the method as rejected in claim 3 above except for explicitly stating the switching means to deactivate or activate the bus. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method to deactivate the data bus, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, USPQ 233.

As per claim 10:

Lai substantially teaches a method for testing memory cells of a DRAM memory chip arranged together with a non-volatile memory chip in a multichip memory module incorporated in an application apparatus, comprising (Figure 1): conducting a self-test of

Art Unit: 2138

the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip in a time period during which the memory cells of the DRAM memory chip are not accessed in an operative operating mode of the application apparatus (column 2, lines 30-67), wherein a data bus of the DRAM memory chip and a data bus of the nonvolatile memory chip are connected (column 3, lines 55-67).

Lai does not explicitly teach the replacement of defective memory cells with redundant memory cells in the DRAM memory chip.

However, Barr in an analogous art teaches the replacement of defective memory cells with redundant memory cells in the DRAM memory chip (Figure 1 # 18, column 3, lines 25-60). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the Lai's invention to replace the defective addresses with redundant memory cells, as it would have enabled Taylor's invention to correct the exact error cell as opposed to resetting the whole DRAM, which would significantly cut down the testing time. Further it should be noted that replacing defective addresses using redundant cells is commonly known in the art and is used repeatedly in the art specially when memory testing is involved.

As per claims 12-17:

Claims 12-17 are directed to an apparatus of the method of Claims 1-11. Taylor, Lai and Barr teach, either alone or in combination as stated above, the method as set forth in Claims 1-11. Therefore, Taylor, Lai and Bar also teach, either alone or in combination as stated above, an apparatus as set forth in Claims 12-17.

As per claims 18-21

Claims 18-21 are directed to means of the method of Claims 1-11 and apparatus of claims 12-17. Taylor, Lai and Barr teach, either alone or in combination as stated above, the method as set forth in Claims 1-11 and apparatus as set forth in Claims 12-17. Therefore, Taylor, Lai and Bar also teach, either alone or in combination as stated above, the means as set forth in Claims 18-21.

Related Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Additional pertinent prior arts, US PG-Pub no. (20020184578 A1) and US Pat no. (4980888 A, 6415403 B1, 6108798 A, US 6536002 B1) mention the same memory self-test method of testing of DRAMs during inactivity are included herein for Applicant's review.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saqib J. Siddiqui whose telephone number is (571) 272-6553. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

Art Unit: 2138

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Saqib Siddiqui
Art Unit 2138
04/27/2006



GUY LAMARRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER